Item 834-F-5
NS 1.20/2:SE-79-31
COMPLETED

Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program

ORIGINAL

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
Division of Science Education
Resources Improvement
Washington, D.C. 20550

(31)

CONTENTS

Page

I. Program Description 1

Introduction 1
General Purposes and Objectives 1
Types of Support 1
Eligibility and Limitations 2

II. Preparation of Proposals 3

Proposal Format and Content for Design Grant Proposals 3
Proposal Format and Content for Institutional and Cooperative Proposals 3
Proposed Format and Content for Special Project Proposals 6
General Fiscal Information 7

III. Submission of Proposals 9

Materials Required 9
Closing Dates and Projected Award Dates 9

IV. Other Considerations in Submitting Proposals 9

Assurance of Compliance With Civil Rights Act 9
NSF Evaluation of Programs 10
Grantee Management and Organization Data 10
Access to Peer Review Information 10
Confidential Aspects of Proposals and Awards 10
Contracting or Transferring the Project Effort 10
Equipment Availability and Use 10

V. Evaluation Criteria and Procedures 11

Proposal Review Procedures and Criteria 12

VI. Project and Award Management 12

Grant Administration 12
NSF Grants 12
Role of the Project Director 12
Changes in Project Operation 13
Project Time Extensions 13
Project Reporting Requirements 13
Government Excess Property 14
Publications 14
Acknowledgment of Support and Disclaimer 14

VII. Appendix

Forms Required in Proposals 15-21
Checklist for Institutional and Cooperative Proposals 22
Important Notice No. 73 23
Form 98A-Final Project Report 25
Important Notice No. 68 27
Applicant Management and Organization Card .... Inside Back Cover
Intent-to-Submit Card .... Inside Back Cover
Proposal Acknowledgment Cards .... Inside Back Cover

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

INTRODUCTION

The National Science Foundation supports a wide variety of programs aimed at strengthening the quality of science education in the Nation. The Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program (MISIP) is one of several programs within the Foundation's Division of Science Education Resources Improvement designed to facilitate the accomplishment of this goal at institutions of higher education. Institutions are encouraged to become familiar with other Foundation programs providing institutional support and to submit proposals to those programs whose objectives agree with those of the institution.

GENERAL PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES

The *purpose* of the Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program is to *effect long-range improvement in science* education at predominantly minority** institutions.* Support is provided for activities designed to enhance an institution's capacity for developing and maintaining a quality science education program for all of its students and to augment the institution's capability for increasing the flow of underrepresented ethnic minorities into scientific careers.

Specific Objectives of the Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program include the following:

- To assist institutions *to improve the quality of preparation* of their students for graduate work or careers in science.
- *To increase the number of minority students graduating* with majors in one of the sciences, mathematics, or engineering.
- *To improve the capability of minority institutions in the area of institutional planning and development in science,* so that they might compete more effectively in assistance programs not specifically intended for minority groups or institutions.

TYPES OF SUPPORT

Support is provided to eligible institutions in three ways: (1) *small design grants* to institutions that do not have formal planning capabilities on campus to provide assistance in developing long-range science improvement plans; (2) *grants to individual institutions* in support of comprehensive science improvement plans; (3) *grants to ad hoc groups or established consortia* of institutions in support of cooperative science improvement projects; and (4) grants to eligible institutions or organizations in support of *special projects* designed to implement Program goals.

Plans set forth in *design grant proposals* are expected to include the conduct of a needs assessment and an analysis of existing resources in science in the proposing institution.

A science improvement plan contained in an *institutional proposal* may include any combination of activities for improving the preparation of students for careers in instruction, research, communications, or applications of science.

Cooperative proposals may include such activities as developing competencies in specific science skills among faculty from several eligible institutions, the offering of specialized undergraduate science courses cooperatively, conferences, workshops, faculty exchange programs, or other activities designed to enhance the general research capability or the quality of science education at minority institutions.

Institutional or cooperative proposals should not request support for faculty or student research projects and related activities. Such support should be sought through other Foundation programs established for those purposes. Support should not be requested for activities resulting from increased enrollments or special admissions policies as these are considered to be institutional responsibilities stemming from institutional policies and decisions. Funds cannot be provided for recruitment activities.

Special projects are designed to increase a minority institution's capacity for providing quality science training or enhancing the general research capabilities of students, faculty and staff at such institutions. Support will be provided for activities such as advanced science seminars, research workshops, faculty training to develop specific skills, curriculum development, preparation of film/audio-visual materials on minorities in science, pre-freshman summer enrichment programs, visiting scientists programs and other projects designed to address specific barriers to the entry of minorities in science. A proposal for a special project is expected, in general, to involve a single activity such as those described above.

**Science* as defined for the purposes of this program includes the biological, engineering, mathematical, physical and social sciences, and the history and philosophy of science; also included are interdisciplinary fields which are comprised of overlapping areas among two or more sciences (e.g., biophysics, geochemistry, biochemistry).

**Minority includes American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Blacks, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans or other disadvantaged ethnic minorities who are underrepresented in science and engineering. A proposing institution's minority enrollment may be predominantly (more than 50 percent) a single minority group or a combination of the minority groups described above. Available data indicate that persons of Oriental descent are not underrepresented in science and engineering.

While the Program staff will discuss proposers' plans informally prior to the submission of a proposal in order to ascertain their eligibility for support, except in the case of special projects, informal or preliminary proposals will not be considered.

ELIGIBILITY AND LIMITATIONS

Institutions eligible to submit proposals to the Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program are accredited* 2- and 4-year institutions of higher education whose enrollments are predominantly American Indian, Alaskan Native, Black, Mexican American, Puerto Rican or other disadvantaged ethnic minorities who are underrepresented in science. It is the responsibility of an individual institution to provide the information necessary to establish its eligibility for participation in MISIP. The data on enrollment furnished to the Office for Civil Rights, HEW to satisfy requirements for the "Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education, 1977" (HEGIS XI: OE Form 2300-2.3) are acceptable.

Eligible 2- and 4-year institutions that have not received previous MISIP support and that do not have formal planning capabilities are eligible to submit *design grant proposals*. For purposes of this Guide, formal planning capabilities include planning, management, and evaluation systems, and Federal relations, institutional research or development offices. Institutions eligible for design grants are not required to apply for such grants prior to applying for other support in MISIP or other Foundation programs.

An ad hoc group or a formal consortium of eligible institutions with common problems may find it both advantageous and cost-effective to propose a cooperative science improvement plan for the group or consortium. While institutions not eligible for MISIP funding may participate in a cooperative project, the fiscal agent for such a project must be an institution eligible for support in this program.

Financial support for design grants should not be requested for periods exceeding 12 months or for sums exceeding $20,000, while support for institutional or cooperative projects should not be requested for periods exceeding 3 years or for amounts in excess of $300,000. Support for projects of shorter duration should be proportionately reduced in terms of total funds requested. Institutional and cooperative proposals should take into consideration an individual institution's size and its resources for continuing project activities when funding ceases.

Financial support for Special Projects should not be requested for periods exceeding 24 months or for sums exceeding $50,000.

Institutional science improvement plans for which MISIP support is requested are expected to be comprehensive in nature, as opposed to focusing on a single improvement such as faculty development or instructional equipment. Therefore, no single budgetary item within an institutional or cooperative proposal (e.g., equipment, faculty and staff salaries, renovation, etc.) should comprise more than 50 percent of the total support requested.

An institution which has, since FY 1972, received two MISIP and/or COSIP-D (College Science Improvement Program-D) awards will not be eligible to submit an institutional proposal to MISIP prior to a waiting period of 3 years between the official expiration date of the most recent MISIP or COSIP-D award and a given MISIP closing date. The policy stated above does *not* include design grants or cooperative grants in which an individual institution participated nor does it exclude an institution from subsequent participation in or submission of a special project or a cooperative proposal. This policy is designed to (a) increase the likelihood that institutions with two previous MISIP awards will seek assistance through other Foundation programs, (b) increase the number of cooperative efforts, and (c) increase the number of eligible institutions reached by the program.

---

*Institutions must be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or must be making satisfactory progress toward achieving accreditation. If additional information is required, contact program staff at 202/282-7760.

Further, during a given fiscal year, an institution may submit only one institutional or design grant proposal. However, an institution is eligible to submit a special project proposal or to participate in an additional proposal of a cooperative nature.

Participation in MISIP does not in any way affect an institution's eligibility to submit proposals or receive support from other Foundation programs. If support is received from other sources for activities which duplicate those contained in a MISIP grant or proposal, however, the Foundation staff should be notified immediately.

II. PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENT FOR DESIGN GRANT PROPOSALS

Each design grant proposal should contain the following:

Cover Sheet
Budget Sheet
Narrative
Curriculum Vitae of Key Project Personnel
  and Consultants
Institutional Data Sheet

The *Cover Sheet* should follow the format of the sample contained in the Appendix but should be clearly labelled in the upper right hand corner as a design grant. Similarly, the *Budget Sheet* should follow the sample in the *Appendix* using only those budget line items that are appropriate for a design grant.

The *Narrative* should not be more than ten pages in length and should contain the following:

1. *Justification of Need for Design Grant*—a brief description should be given of why the institution is eligible for this activity and why such assistance is needed. The administrative structure of the institution should be described.
2. *Project Objectives and Design*—a statement of the specific objectives of the design project and a brief description of the activities proposed to accomplish these objectives should be given. A plan for conducting a needs assessment, an analysis of existing institutional resources in science, and for developing a realistic long-range science improvement plan should be described.
3. *Organization/Management Plan and Timetable*—a brief description of the role and relevant skills of each key person involved in the project, including consultants, and a timetable for major project tasks to be accomplished should be presented.
4. *Expected Outcomes*—a brief description of benefits to be derived from the project should be given.
5. *Institutional Support of the Project*—a statement should be included from the chief executive officer of the institution endorsing the project and indicating how the project will accelerate the attainment of institutional goals in science.

The science improvement plan resulting from a design grant may be used in the development of an institutional proposal. However, the proposal should not request MISIP support for the entire long-range science improvement plan. Each institutional proposal resulting from a design grant will be judged on its own merit in competition with all other proposals submitted on a given closing date.

PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL AND COOPERATIVE PROPOSALS

Each proposal should contain the following in the order listed:

Cover Sheet
Budget Sheet
Supplementary Budget Pages
Project Summary Pages
Institutional Data Sheet

Institutional Budget for Science Sheets
Information on Current or Proposed Projects
Summary Information on Previous Science Education Awards
Abstract
Narrative
Curriculum Vitae of Key Project Personnel
Local Review Statement

Forms for the Cover Sheet, Budget Sheet, Supplementary Budget Pages, Project Summary, Institutional Data Sheet, and Institutional Budget for Science Sheets are exhibited in the Appendix. These forms should be reproduced and used in the preparation of proposals.

Cover Sheet

Near the top of the Cover Sheet, the type of proposal is to be indicated either as "Institutional" or "Cooperative". The entry for Name of Submitting Organization on the Cover Sheet for an institutional proposal is the official name of the proposed grantee institution. In the case of cooperative projects, this entry is the name of one of the cooperating eligible institutions agreeing to act as the legal fiscal agent and principal coordinator of the proposed activities. The item indicating total support requested should be the same figure as shown in Item Q on the Budget Sheet.

Signature Copy—The names and titles of the proposed Project Director and of an official authorized to sign for the proposed grantee institution are to be typed on the Cover Sheet of all copies of the proposal. For cooperative proposals, an additional page should be appended to the Cover Sheet which includes the signatures of an authorized official and an assisting project director from each of the cooperating institutions. The Cover Sheet(s) of ONE copy of the proposal must bear the original signatures of each individual. The signature of the authorized official signifies cognizance of eligibility and limitation requirements, endorsement of the proposal, and commitment to provide the specified support of the proposed activities in the event a grant is made.

Proposal Budget and Supplementary Budget Pages

The plan described in the proposal may use a variety of means to effect improvement deemed appropriate in the local context. On the proposal budget, proposed expenditures are to be summarized according to the pertinent categories shown on the form. Not all Proposal Budget items apply to these grants. On the *Supplementary Budget Pages*, proposed expenditures supporting each planned activity during each year of the project are to be exhibited for each science department involved in the plan.

Project Summary Pages

The objectives which the proposed science improvement plan is designed to fulfill are to be listed in order of priority. For each objective, specify the activities which are proposed to attain the objective and the amount of funds requested to support each of these activities.

Institutional Data and Budget for Science Sheets

These Sheets provide information on the institution's current science program relative to its overall educational program and on the projected impact of the proposed science improvement plan.

An *Institutional Budget for Science Sheet* should be prepared for each science department of the institution involved in the project, showing the allocation of institutional funds to each of the indicated categories during the preceding, current, and succeeding academic years. In the last column of each departmental table, the amount of NSF funds the science improvement plan proposes to expend in each of the categories listed should be indicated.

For cooperative proposals, each participating institution should complete a set of institutional data and budget for science sheets as described above.

Information Regarding NSF Applicants' Current Science Education and Research Activities

Each proposal must list all current projects, in addition to the proposed project, to which the senior personnel have committed a portion of their time, whether or not salary for the person involved is included in the budgets of the various projects. This information should include the titles and dates of current grants or contracts, the source of funds, annual budget levels, and the person-months devoted to each project by each of the senior personnel. The proposal must also provide analogous information for all other proposed projects which are being considered by or which will be submitted in the near future to other possible sponsors, including other Foundation programs. Concurrent submission of a proposal to other organizations will not prejudice its review by the Foundation.

Summary Information on Previous Science Education Awards

Institutions, whether submitting individual proposals or participating in proposals submitted by consortia that have received previous grants from the Science Education Directorate of the National Science Foundation within the last 5 years, are to prepare a brief summary statement containing the following information for those grants:

a. Grant number, title, date, and amount.
b. Summary of objectives and activities of each previous Science Education award.
c. Evidence of success in attaining objectives of previous Science Education awards and a description of how the institution is maintaining activities from these awards.
d. A description of how the proposed project relates to previous Science Education award objectives and accomplishments, where appropriate.
e. A description of the institution's progress in attaining its long-range science goals as a result of the proposed project, previous Science Education awards, the institution's own efforts in science, and any other externally funded projects involving science.

Abstract

The Abstract, of no more than one page in length, should present a synopsis of the proposed plan of activities for improving the institution's science capabilities. If the proposed project is funded, the Abstract will be available to the public. The Abstract should therefore be in language which could be understood by the general public.

Narrative

The Narrative should be no more than 20 double-spaced typewritten pages in length. It should begin with a brief description, of perhaps half a page, of the institution, containing such information as average enrollment, type of location (small college town, urban, etc.), type of school (liberal arts college, teachers college, state university, etc.), fields of emphasis, degrees offered, etc.

The Narrative should briefly describe the institution's commitment to providing a quality science program for its students as reflected in on-going science activities at the institution.

The proposed science improvement plan should be fully described. Such a description should provide specific information on the following:

1. *Institutional Needs in Science*—Compare institutional objectives in science with existing conditions and resources in science for the purpose of identifying significant needs and for providing a frame of reference for the proposed improvement strategy.
2. *Specific Needs to be Addressed and Relationship to MISIP Objectives*—Describe the specific needs or objectives of the proposed plan, the basis for their selection from among those needs identified in (1) and their relevance to stated MISIP objectives.
3. *Strategy to be Utilized*—Describe the specific activities that are designed to meet the needs identified in (2). Discuss the appropriateness of these activities as well as the likelihood of their success.
4. *Organization/Management and Work/Monitoring Plan*—Describe the administrative mechanisms to be used in organizing and managing the project, including a summary description of relevant skills of persons who will have major project responsibilities. (Curriculum Vitae should be appended to the Narrative). Describe a procedure for monitoring the progress of the project including a timetable for accomplishing major project tasks and milestones. Progress reports, advisory committee meetings, and similar events should be described and shown in the timetable.
5. *Expected Outcomes*—Provide details on the expected outcomes and potential impact of the project on the institution. Describe the likely institutional gain which will result. Describe how minority students in particular will benefit from this project.

6. *Scientific and Educational Value of the Proposed Project*—The relationship of the proposed project to the present state of science education and its potential for future contributions to science education should be described.

7. *Evaluation Plan*—Describe a mechanism for determining whether project objectives have been accomplished and for measuring impact of the project. Such an evaluation plan may be entirely internal in nature or it may involve outside consultants. Outline specific roles or responsibilities of individuals and/or committees.

8. *Plan for Continuation*—Discuss procedures for integrating project activities and related costs into the institution's on-going educational program and budget.

Improvement plans with activities involving equipment purchases should (a) describe existing major holdings for those areas in which requests are made, (b) contain a list of proposed purchases with estimated costs, and (c) provide adequate justification for such purchases. Improvement plans involving the preparation of curriculum and audio-visual materials must justify the need for such materials and state that the materials to be prepared do not already exist. In addition, proposals must justify in detail all other major items for which funding is requested.

Cooperative proposals should also contain a clear description of the common needs of the cooperating institutions toward which the plan is directed as well as the various roles of the participating schools in the project.

Local Review Statement

A local review statement signed by the chief executive officer of the institution *must* be appended to the proposal. Such a statement should contain: (a) a description of how the objectives of the proposed project relate to institutional goals and objectives, and (b) evidence of commitment of those institutional resources necessary for the successful implementation of the proposed project and to the continuation of project activities after the award expires.

In the case of cooperative proposals, a Local Review Statement must be included from each of the cooperating institutions, indicating the significance of the proposed project to that particular institution's stated goals and objectives.

PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENT FOR SPECIAL PROJECT PROPOSALS

Each special project proposal should contain the following in the prescribed order:

Cover Sheet
Budget Sheet
Abstract
Narrative
Curriculum Vitae of Key Project Personnel and Consultants
Summary Information on Previous Science Education Awards
Local Review Statement

The Cover and Budget Sheets should follow the format samples found in the Appendix using those items appropriate for special projects. Additionally, "Special Projects" should be circled on the Cover Sheet.

The Narrative should not exceed 15 double-spaced typewritten pages and should include the following:

1. *Background*—A brief description of the specific problem or need area this project is designed to address should be given. Where applicable, relationships to previous, current or proposed MISIP projects should be described.

2. *Objectives*—A statement of the objective(s) of the proposed project as well as their relevance to MISIP objectives should be given.

3. *Methods, Materials and Procedures*—Activities proposed to accomplish stated objectives should be described. A description of instruments, techniques, statistical analyses, and key project personnel and consultant roles should be given.

4. *Expected Outcomes and Dissemination Plans*—Beneficial results and means of their dissemination, if appropriate, should be given.

5. *Scientific and Educational Value of the Proposed Project*—The relationship of the proposed project to the present state of science education and its potential for future contributions to science education should be described.
6. *Institutional Support of the Project*—A statement should be included from the chief executive officer of the institution endorsing the project and indicating how the project will accelerate the attainment of institutional goals in science.

The Abstract, Summary Information on Previous Science Education Awards, and the Local Review Statement should be prepared following the guidelines in the previous section on Institutional and Cooperative Proposals.

GENERAL FISCAL INFORMATION

Budget Guidelines (See page 2 for limitations on grant duration and size.)

Design Grants—Eligible budget items include, but are not limited to, replacement time for science faculty, the use of consultants, and summer planning workshops. Funds may be requested for part-time replacements during the academic year up to 50 percent of the academic year salaries for key science faculty who would be involved in project activities. Local rates paid for part-time instructors and for consultants should be used in preparing these budget items. Fees for consultants may not, however, exceed the daily equivalent for the U.S. Government GS-18 salary ($183).

For faculty participation in summer planning workshops, a maximum of two-ninths of a faculty member's current academic year salary for 8 weeks of full-time involvement is allowable. Requests for shorter periods or for part-time involvement should be proportionately reduced. Requests for financial support of students involved in the project should be restricted to the summer and should be based upon government approved work-study rates in operation at the institution.

Institutional or Cooperative Proposals—The plan described in the proposal may involve a variety of means for affecting improvements in science. Specific exclusions exist, however, for requesting Foundation support.

NSF funds will not be provided for:

- undergraduate scholarships (but student wages for special activities in the project are permitted);
- augmenting the salary rate for faculty members pursuing regularly assigned duties or to support any other on-going regular activity at the institution; or
- the construction of major new buildings. This does not preclude Foundation support for such remodeling or renovation of existing facilities as may be required to carry out activities which are a part of the improvement program.

Support may be requested for direct costs of the science improvement project including, but not limited to, the following: faculty and student participants in summer workshops related to the project, "replacements" during the academic year for faculty members engaged in further study or work on course or curriculum revision, costs of clerical and technical support directly related to project activities, undergraduate assistants involved in project activities, purchase of instructional scientific equipment essential to the project, travel expenses directly related to project activities, fees and expenses for consultants, and salaries for new full-time science faculty who are part of the improvement plan. Payment for a consultant's services may not exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum rate paid a U.S. Government GS-18, unless specifically authorized by law.

Proposals of more than 1 year's duration requesting support for new faculty are expected to reflect a decreasng schedule of NSF support for such positions over the grant period.

Funds may be requested to provide faculty replacements for the project director or for key faculty members engaged in project activities. The following methods for handling such cases are suggested:

(a) If the faculty member is given released time by the institution during the academic year, either for the full year or a fraction thereof (e.g., one semester, or one or more quarters), the institution should continue to provide the faculty member's usual salary and benefits in the normal way, and request funds to provide a replacement for the faculty member during this period and for the extent to which the faculty member is involved in project activities.

(b) Support for faculty activity in the summer may not exceed two-ninths of a faculty member's current academic year salary for full-time involvement for an 8-week period. Support for shorter periods of time or for part-time involvement should be proportionately reduced. Requests for support for student assistants engaged in project activities should be at the approved work-study rate in effect at the institution.

If staff benefits are treated as an item of direct cost, funds to provide these benefits may be requested at the rate normally in effect for the institution. If staff benefits are treated as an item of indirect cost in the negotiation of the institution's Indirect Cost Rate, funds for staff benefits may not be requested.

For each year of the project, funds should be requested to cover the round-trip jet-economy fare to Washington, D.C. plus an amount for subsistence calculated according to institutional policy to enable the project director to attend a 2-day meeting of project directors.

Special Projects—Support may be requested for a number of budget items, including, but not limited to, the following: travel expenses directly related to the project; travel, honorarium and related expenses in accordance with local practice (with honoraria not to exceed the daily equivalent for the U.S. Government Salary GS-18) for consultants; replacement time for science faculty (refer to the above section for details on limitations on faculty replacement time); faculty participation in summer workshops or summer planning activities (refer to the above section for limitations on faculty summer involvement); faculty training or instructional skills development; clerical and technical support directly related to project activities; and graduate/undergraduate assistants involved in project activities.

Examples of other eligible budget items include costs associated with the sponsoring of or expenses related to the conduct of advanced science seminars and research workshops; pre-freshman summer science and mathematics enrichment programs; establishment of a visiting scientists program; curriculum development and faculty workshop projects in introductory mathematics; preparation of audio-visual (slides, films, film loops or cassette packages) materials on minorities in science; preparation of printed materials on science career information to students and parents; or a study of ways established minority scientists have overcome barriers to their participation in science.

Indirect Costs

Each proposal may include indirect costs at the rate approved for the institution. Proposals should specify the institution's approved rate and, if different, the rate requested for the proposed activities. The approved rate and the base for the computation may be obtained from the business officer of the institution. That person should contact the Foundation's Division of Grants and Contracts, Policy and Cost Analysis Branch if the organization does not have an approved rate or is a first time applicant, or if information is needed with regard to an approved rate at (202/632-7545).

In the case of proposals from formally organized consortia, the above procedures should be followed if an approved indirect cost rate is available for the consortium. In all other cases of consortium proposals, indirect cost amounts for the cooperating institutions should be computed using the approved rates for those institutions.

III. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

MATERIALS REQUIRED

Fifteen (15) copies of a proposal (including the Signature Copy) along with three (3) copies of the college catalog are required.

Proposals and catalogs should be mailed in a single package to:

Central Processing Section for
Minority Institutions Science Improvement
Division of Science Education Resources
Improvement
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C. 20550

Each copy of a proposal should be on standard (8½ by 11") paper, printed on one side only, double-spaced, and stapled only in the upper left hand corner with no covering or binding material. A *Checklist* for institutional and cooperative proposals is contained in the Appendix. This form is to assist institutions in the submission of complete proposals.

To facilitate prompt acknowledgment of the arrival of the package at its destination, the proposer should cut out two postcards from the back cover of this Guide, fill them in to identify the proposal, address one card to the project director and the other to the official authorized to sign the Cover Sheet, and attach them firmly to the Cover Sheet of the Signature Copy. When the package arrives, the date of receipt and an assigned proposal number will be stamped on the card before it is returned, so that thereafter the proposer and the Foundation may refer to this proposal number in correspondence about the proposal. If an acknowledgment card is not received within 3 weeks of the mailing date, the Foundation staff should be notified immediately.

CLOSING DATES AND PROJECTED AWARD DATES

The established closing dates for the receipt of institutional or cooperative proposals during FY 1979 and FY 1980 are December 4, 1978 and December 4, 1979, respectively.

Proposals must be received at the above address by close of business on the stated closing date to insure inclusion in the competitive review process. Awards from each year's competition are expected to be announced the following May.

Proposals should not be submitted earlier than one month before the established closing date for a given fiscal year.

Design grant and special project proposals may be submitted at any time during a fiscal year. However, proposers are cautioned to take the following into consideration when submitting proposals and establishing starting dates for proposed projects:

- The fiscal year ends on September 30.
- A minimum of six (6) months should be allowed for the processing of design grant and special project proposals.

Proposers should submit written notification of any developments, following submission of a proposal, that might significantly affect the proposed science improvement plan. The program staff will contact proposers if additional information is required. All final decisions are announced by written notification to the project director and to officials of the proposing institution. *Prior to this notification, no information can be given on the probability of support for any proposal.*

IV. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS IN SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

If the applicant institution has not filed an Assurance of Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as required by NSF regulation, pertinent forms and a copy of the regulations may be obtained by writing to the Foundation's Division of Grants and Contracts. The required Assurance Form, when completed by the institution, should be submitted to the Division of Grants and Contracts. Once an Assurance Form has been submitted by the applicant organization, it covers all proposals subsequently submitted by any department or other unit of that organization. Individual Assurance Forms are not necessary for each application or for each proposal. If there is some question as to whether an institution has filed an Assurance of Compliance, the institution's business office should be consulted.

In the case of cooperative projects, the grantee must receive from the cooperating colleges, universities, or other subrecipients an Assurance of Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or written notification that such Assurance of Compliance has been previously filed with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or with the National Science Foundation. Copies of the Assurance of Compliance Form to be used by the subrecipient will be supplied by the Division of Grants and Contracts upon request; completed forms or written notifications are to be retained by the grantee for the tenure of the grant.

NSF EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

Proposers should be aware that the Foundation may, as a part of its own program evaluation activities, carry out in-depth evaluations of selected awarded projects through independent third parties. Thus, proposers should be prepared to cooperate with evaluators eventually retained by the Foundation to analyze both the institutional context and the impact of any supported project.

GRANTEE MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION DATA

Prior to making an award, the Foundation must receive certain data describing the nature of the applicant organization and a certification that the applicant has legal authority to accept Federal funds and the financial management capability to ensure stewardship of such funds.

If your organization has not submitted basic organization and management information to the Foundation within the previous two years, the grantee organization and management card on the back cover should be submitted with the formal proposal.

ACCESS TO PEER REVIEW INFORMATION

After final decisions have been announced, the Foundation will, upon request, inform the project director of the reasons for its decision on the proposal. Verbatim copies of reviews, not including the identity of the reviewer, will be made available to respective project directors upon specific request.

CONFIDENTIAL ASPECTS OF PROPOSALS AND AWARDS

When a proposal results in a grant, it becomes a part of the record of the Foundation's transaction, available to the public upon specific request. Information that the Foundation and the grantee mutually agree to be of a privileged nature will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law; therefore, any information that the applicant wishes to have the Foundation consider as privileged should be clearly marked as such and sent in a separate statement, two copies of which should accompany the proposal.

A proposal that does not result in a grant may be retained by the Foundation. Such a proposal will be released only: (1) with the consent of the proposer; or (2) to the extent required by law. A proposal may be withdrawn at any time prior to final action thereon by the Foundation.

CONTRACTING OR TRANSFERRING THE PROJECT EFFORT

Excluding the purchase of commercially available supplies, materials, equipment or general support services allowable under the grant, none of the research or substantive effort under an NSF grant may be contracted or otherwise transferred to another organization without prior NSF approval. Normally, the intent to so contract is fully disclosed in the proposed submission, and evidence of NSF prior approval appears in the grant instrument. In the event the need arises to so contract after a grant has been made, the grantee must submit to the NSF Grants Officer the proposed performance statement and budget, a statement indicating the basis for selection of the contractor and a justification of the proposed arrangement. The request must be signed by the principal investigator/project director and endorsed by the Authorized Organizational Representative. NSF approval will be indicated by letter from the Grants Officer.

EQUIPMENT AVAILABILITY AND USE

If a proposal for NSF support involves the purchase or lease of special purpose equipment, having a unit acquisition cost exceeding $10,000, it must contain a certification by the authorized organizational representative that the equipment is (a) essential and not reasonably available and accessible to the project and, if funded by NSF will be subject to (b) reasonable inventory controls and maintenance procedures and (c) organizational policies designed to enhance multiple or shared use on other projects if such other use will not interfere with the work on the project for which the equipment is being acquired (see NSF Grant Policy Manual (NSF 77-47) paragraph 332. "Equipment Management Standards." and paragraph 512. "Equipment").

V. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

The excellence of Foundation-supported activities is heavily dependent upon evaluations received from the scientific and educational communities. Proposals will be reviewed competitively by panels composed of scientists and educators outside of the Foundation and by the program staff.

Design grant and special projects will be evaluated using the following criteria:

1. Adequacy of justification of need for the design grant or special project
2. Relevance of project objectives to MISIP objectives and adequacy of the proposed plan for accomplishing stated objectives
3. Adequacy of the proposed personnel, the organization/management plan, and the timetable for implementing the plan
4. Potential institutional impact of the project
5. Institutional commitment to the project

Additional criteria for *special projects* will include:

6. Expected outcomes and dissemination plans, where appropriate, and
7. Scientific and educational value of the proposed project

For institutional and cooperative proposals, peer reviewers will give primary consideration to the following criteria:

- *Identification of Institutional Needs*—Have specific needs in science been identified?
- *Congruence with MISIP Goals*—How relevant are the objectives of the plan described in the proposal to stated MISIP goals?
- *Appropriateness and Adequacy of the Plan for the Proposed Objectives*—How appropriate are the proposed activities to the proposed objectives? Is the proposed plan likely to achieve the stated objectives?
- *Adequacy of Organization/Management and Work/Monitoring Plan*—Do the teaching and administrative loads for key project personnel provide adequate time for the project? Are the existing and/or proposed faculty, staff and facilities for implementation of the project adequate? Is the time schedule described in the proposal appropriate? Is the monitoring plan described adequate?
- *Impact Potential of Project*—Is the likely institutional gain from implementation of the proposed project substantial? Is the description for integrating the proposed plan into the existing educational program at the institution adequate? Are the expected outcomes likely to result in the accomplishment of stated MISIP goals?
- *The Scientific and Educational Value of the Proposed Project*—Do the techniques and approaches proposed reasonably reflect what is known to be effective in science education? Is there a potential use of some aspects of the project at other institutions?
- *Adequacy of Evaluation Plan*—Is the evaluation plan described sufficient for determining whether project objectives have been met? Can it reasonably measure project impact?
- *Evidence of Institutional Commitment to Science and to the Project and its Future Support*—Does the proposal present clear evidence of past commitment to the provision of a quality science program for its students? Is the indication of institutional commitment to absorb any after-the-grant burden initiated by the project adequate? Is the plan for continuation of proposed project activities adequate when funding ceases?

Among the criteria listed above, greater emphasis will be placed upon the impact potential of the project, its overall scientific and educational value, and the institution's commitment to science and to the project.

In the evaluation of proposals from or involving institutions with previous Science Education awards, consideration will be given by the staff to the degree of success in accomplishing the objectives of previous awards.

PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

Final decisions on proposals to be supported will be made by NSF. Selection will be made in merit order, except that in the case of proposals of substantially equal merit (as determined by the merit review process) use may be made of other criteria such as geographical or disciplinary distribution of funds, distribution of awards among appropriate types of institutions, or other criteria determined to be consistent with Foundation policy and legislative intent.

VI. PROJECT AND AWARD MANAGEMENT

GRANT ADMINISTRATION

Grants will be administered in accordance with the terms and conditions of the award instrument.

An NSF grant is normally made to an organization, known as the grantee, rather than to the individual principal investigator or project director who proposed to conduct the project.

Notification of an award is made by letter signed by the NSF Grants Officer. The grant establishes a relationship between NSF and the grantee in which:

a. NSF agrees to provide financial support for the project to be performed, under the provisions of the grant instrument.

b. The grantee agrees to the performance of the project, to the prudent management of the funds provided by the grant and to the provisions of the grant instrument.

The grantee is free to accept or reject the grant. Normally, action to obtain Federal funds constitutes acceptance of a grant once it is made. However, in some cases, NSF may require written acceptance.

NSF GRANTS

The grant letter, signed by the NSF Grants Officer, constitutes official notification of Foundation support. The grant letter is addressed to the appropriate official of the grantee institution with copies to the project director and the business officer of the institution.

Incorporated into the grant is the approved budget. The grant provides authority to the grantee to commit funds for support of the project at any time between the effective date and the expiration date of the grant. As stated in the grant letter, a grant in the Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program must be administered in accordance with this Guide and the grant conditions as specified in the award instrument. The grant is made in support of the plan described in the approved proposal, and shall be carried out in conformance with that plan, subject to changes made by mutual consent of the grantee and the NSF program staff. Any change in the plan, the procedures or activities for implementing the plan, project director, or personnel charged with responsibility for any major component of the project requires the prior written approval of the NSF program staff.

ROLE OF THE PROJECT DIRECTOR

It is expected that the project director will represent the institution or group of institutions in its dealings with the Foundation on substantive matters relating to the grant. He or she is responsible for all aspects of the day-to-day administration of the project—for insuring that funds are expended for purposes and at rates specified in the grant instrument, for guiding personnel employed in the project, for continually reevaluating project plans and results with a view toward determining if and when unforeseen developments require minor or major changes, for providing liaison with the Foundation, and for timely preparation and submission of required reports (other than fiscal reports). The project director is expected to attend the annual meeting for project directors held in Washington, D.C.

All correspondence regarding the operation of the project and any requests for modifications must be prepared and signed by the project director, with the exception of correspondence requesting a change in project director which must originate with the administrative head of the institution.

Since the project director bears primary responsibility for the success of the project, the incumbent should be replaced only for pressing reasons. When it appears that such a change is necessary, the administrative head of the institution or an official authorized to sign for him or her shall write the Foundation, setting forth the reasons requiring the change, the name of the person being nominated, and include a brief vita showing his or her qualifications for conducting this project. No change in project director shall be effective without written confirmation from the Foundation.

CHANGES IN PROJECT OPERATION

Foundation approval must be obtained in accordance with the award instrument.

Approval is required for any major project changes, which include those:

a. Affecting the overall intent or scope of the approved project.

b. Involving a change in project director.

c. Involving a change in equipment valued at $1,000 or more.

d. Involving a time extension for completion of grant activities.

Requests for such changes should be addressed either to the Grants Officer or the MISIP Program Director in accordance with page 135 of the NSF Grant Policy Manual (NSF 77-47). Such requests should be from the project director and must be countersigned by the Authorized Organizational Representative.

PROJECT TIME EXTENSIONS

It is expected that projects will be completed within the time period specified in the award instrument. Therefore requests for no-cost time extensions should be submitted only under the most unusual of circumstances.

Requests for no-cost extensions must be received *at least 45 days* prior to the expiration date of the grant, signed by both the project director and the Authorized Organizational Representative. The letter must fully justify the need for the extension, include an estimate of the unobligated funds remaining, and describe a plan for their use. This plan must coincide with the original or amended objectives of the project. The fact that funds remain at the expiration of an award is not justification for an extension.

PROJECT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Interim Reports—For grants having a duration of more than 1 year, interim reports should be submitted by the project director to the MISIP program staff at the end of each academic year's activities, covering such matters as (1) progress to date in comparison with the project schedule, (2) results to date of the ongoing monitoring/evaluation process, (3) problems encountered and methods used in solving them, and (4) circumstances or considerations which might significantly affect subsequent phases of the project. Interim reports should not include requests for NSF approval for major changes. Such requests should in all cases be the subject of separate correspondence.

The Foundation's simplified grant close-out procedures are set forth as follows in Important Notices No. 68 and No. 73 contained in the Appendix:

1. A Final Project Report (NSF Form 98A, revised May, 1978) is to be submitted within 90 days after expiration of the award to:
   Division of Grants and Contracts
   National Science Foundation
   Washington, D.C. 20550

2. Part III-Technical Information (See Part III, item l.e., NSF Form 98A.) This item is to contain the same elements of information as Part II, Summary of Completed Project, but with greater technical detail. Special attention should be given to the results to date of the project evaluation plan that was outlined in the original narrative. This information is to be submitted directly to the MISIP Program.

3. Final expenditure information is also required for each completed grant. This is provided through the quarterly Federal Cash Transactions Report (FCTR, formerly

known as the Quarterly Expenditures Report). The Foundation's computerized version of FCTR is forwarded to the fiscal officer of each grantee institution by the Foundation's Division of Financial and Administrative Management (DFA) in the month following the close of each calendar quarter. Procedures for reporting are sent to grantees at the time an award is made. Completed FCTR's are returned to:

Division of Financial and
Administrative Management
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C. 20550

GOVERNMENT EXCESS PROPERTY

MISIP grantees are eligible to acquire government excess property (scientific equipment and supplies) through no-cost transfers from the Federal Government to the grantee institution. Those not acquainted with this procedure should request a copy of NSF Important Notice No. 58 and a supply of Form SF 122 from the Project Property Section, Division of Grants and Contracts, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550. The total value of the property to be acquired under a grant is normally limited to the amount of the grant.

PUBLICATIONS

The Foundation provides grant and contract support for research and education in the sciences. The grantee or contractor is wholly responsible for the conduct of such research, publication of the results therefrom and the preparation of curricular materials. The Foundation, therefore, does not assume responsibility for such findings or their interpretation or the content of such curricular materials. Nevertheless, the Foundation retains the right to approve the distribution of such materials.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SUPPORT AND DISCLAIMER

An acknowledgment of NSF support and a disclaimer must appear in any publication of any material, whether copyrighted or not, based on or developed under this project, in the following terms:

"This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. (Grantee should enter NSF grant number)."

All materials, except scientific articles or papers published in scientific journals, must also contain the following:

"Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation."

DIRECTORATE FOR SCIENCE EDUCATION

PROPOSAL TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Cover Page

FOR CONSIDERATION BY NSF ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT (Indicate the most specific unit known, i.e. program, division, etc.) MINORITY INSTITUTIONS SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	ARE ANY FUNDS IN THIS PROPOSAL REQUESTED ELSEWHERE IN NSF OR ANOTHER AGENCY? YES_____ NO _____; IF YES, EXPLAIN ON BACK.
PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT/SOLICITATION NO.: SE 79-31	CLOSING DATE (CIRCLE ONE) Dec. 4, 1978; Dec. 4, 1979

NAME OF SUBMITTING ORGANIZATION TO WHICH AWARD SHOULD BE MADE (INCLUDE BRANCH/CAMPUS/OTHER COMPONENTS)

ADDRESS OF ORGANIZATION (INCLUDE ZIP CODE)

CIRCLE TYPE OF PROJECT: INSTITUTIONAL, COOPERATIVE, DESIGN, SPECIAL (FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS, SPECIFY TITLE)

REQUESTED AMOUNT FROM NSF	**PROPOSED DURATION**	**DESIRED STARTING DATE**

PI/PD NAME AND SOCIAL SECURITY NO. (SSN)*	**PI/PD PHONE NO.** OFFICE: HOME:
PI/PD DEPARTMENT	**PI/PD ORGANIZATION**
ADDITIONAL PI/PD AND SSN*	**ADDITIONAL PI/PD AND SSN***
ADDITIONAL PI/PD AND SSN*	**ADDITIONAL PI/PD AND SSN***

*Submission of social security numbers is voluntary and will not affect the organization's eligibility for an award. However, they are an integral part of the NSF information system and assist in processing the proposal. SSN solicited under NSF Act of 1950, as amended.

DISCIPLINE(S) INVOLVED IN PROJECT:

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/ PROJECT DIRECTOR	AUTHORIZED ORGANIZATIONAL REP.	OTHER ENDORSEMENT (optional)
NAME (Prof., Dr., Mr., Ms.)	**NAME** (Prof., Dr., Mr., Ms.)	**NAME** (Prof., Dr., Mr., Ms.)
SIGNATURE	**SIGNATURE**	**SIGNATURE**
TITLE	**TITLE**	**TITLE**
DATE	**DATE**	**DATE**

SUMMARY
PROPOSAL BUDGET

FOR NSF USE ONLY	
PROPOSAL NO.	
DURATION (MONTHS)	
PROPOSED	REVISED

ORGANIZATION AND ADDRESS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/PROJECT DIRECTOR

NSF USE	A. **SENIOR PERSONNEL** (LIST BY NAME; SHOW NUMBERS OF PEOPLE IN BRACKETS; SALARY AMOUNTS MAY BE LISTED ON SEPARATE SCHEDULE) GPM 205.1b	NSF FUNDED MAN MONTHS CAL.	ACAD.	SUMR.	FUNDS REQUESTED BY PROPOSER	FUNDS GRANTED BY NSF (IF DIFFERENT)
	1. P.I./P.D.				$	$
	2. CO P.I./P.D.				$	$
	3. CO P.I./P.D.				$	$
	4. CO P.I./P.D.				$	$
	5. CO P.I./P.D.				$	$
11115	6. ( ) ◄—— SUBTOTALS A1 - A5 ——►				$	$
	FACULTY AND OTHER SENIOR ASSOCIATES (ATTACH EXTRA SHEET IF NECESSARY)					
	7.				$	$
	8.				$	$
	9.				$	$
	10.				$	$
	11.				$	$
11117	12. ( ) ◄—— SUBTOTALS A7 - A11 ——►				$	$
	B. **OTHER PERSONNEL** (LIST NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)					
11141	1. ( ) POSTDOCTORAL ASSOCIATES				$	$
11149	2. ( ) OTHER PROFESSIONALS				$	$
11150	3. ( ) GRADUATE STUDENTS				$	$
11152	4. ( ) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS				$	$
11182	5. ( ) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL				$	$
11183	6. ( ) TECHNICAL, SHOP, OTHER				$	$
	TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A+B)				$	$
11200	C. **FRINGE BENEFITS** (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)				$	$
	TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A+B+C)				$	$
	D. **EQUIPMENT** (LIST ITEMS AND DOLLAR AMOUNTS FOR EACH ITEM)					
23181	TOTAL EQUIPMENT				$	$
	E. **MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES**					
32630					$	$
	F. **DOMESTIC TRAVEL**					
42111					$	$
	G. **FOREIGN TRAVEL** (LIST DESTINATION AND AMOUNT FOR EACH TRIP; GPM 731)					
42112					$	$

PAGE 1 OF 2 PAGES

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET

PROPOSAL NO.

52500	**H. PUBLICATION COSTS/PAGE CHARGES**	$	$
62315	**I. COMPUTER (ADPE) SERVICES**	$	$
	J. CONSULTANT SERVICES (IDENTIFY CONSULTANTS BY NAME AND AMOUNT; GPM 516)		
		$	$
	K. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS, IF ALLOWED BY PROGRAM GUIDE (ITEMIZE) GPM 518		
	1. STIPENDS $		
	2. TRAVEL $		
	3. SUBSISTENCE $		
	4. OTHER - SPECIFY $		
	5. TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS (K1 + K2 + K3 + K4)	$	$
	L. ALL OTHER DIRECT COSTS (List items and dollar amounts. Details of subcontracts, including work statements and budget, should be explained in full in proposal.)		
	$		
	$		
	$		
	$		
65001	TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS	$	$
	M. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH L)	$	$
	N. INDIRECT COSTS (Specify rate(s) and base(s) for on/off campus activity. Where both are involved, identify itemized costs included in on/off campus bases in remarks.)		
74100	TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	$	$
	O. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (M + N)	$	$
74500	**P. LESS RESIDUAL FUNDS** (If for further support of current project; GPM 252 and 253)	$	$
75000	**Q. AMOUNT OF THIS REQUEST** (O MINUS P)	$	$

REMARKS

NOTE: SIGNATURES REQUIRED ONLY FOR REVISED BUDGET (GPM 233). THIS IS REVISION NO.

SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/PROJECT DIRECTOR	DATE OF SIGNATURE	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND TITLE
SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE	DATE OF SIGNATURE	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND TITLE

FOR NSF USE ONLY

INDIRECT COST RATE VERIFICATION			PROGRAM OFFICER APPROVAL
Date Checked	Date of Rate Sheet	Signature	

Grant Number	Amend No.	Institution	Organization	Fund Acct.	Program	Object	

	Proposal Number	Dur.	Chg.	Award Date	Proposed Amount	Propsd. Dur.	

SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET PAGES

(NAME OF INSTITUTION)

Activity	Refer to Narrative Page No.	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Total

(SCIENCE DEPARTMENT)

	Total:				

(SCIENCE DEPARTMENT)

	Total:				

PROJECT SUMMARY

____
(NAME OF INSTITUTION)

Objectives	Activities to Attain Objectives	Projected Cost Allocation
1.	a. b. c. d.	a. b. c. d.
2.	a. b.	a. b.
3.	a.	a.

INSTITUTIONAL*DATA NAME OF INSTITUTION ____________________

(This form should be completed by two-year institutions to the extent applicable, with appropriate substitutions made)

Highest Degree Offered in Science: ____________________ Circle Type of Institution: (2-year, 4-year, 4-year +)

Total Student Enrollment (F.T.E.) ____________________ Circle One; (Accredited, Non-Accredited)

					MINORITY DATA**			
	Total for Inst.	Total for Nat. & Phy.Sci.	Total for Soc. Sci.	Total for Engineering	Total for Inst.	Total for Math. & Phy.Sci.	Total for Soc.Sci.	Total for Engineering
1. Faculty (F.T.E.)								
2. Undergraduate Student Body (F.T.E.)								
3. Jr. Sr. Student Body (F.T.E.)								
4. Undergraduate Degrees Awarded Last AY								
5. Educational and General Budget								
6. Average Faculty Salary								
7. Average Teaching Load (In semester or quarter hrs.;specify which)								
8. Average class size								
9. No. of Library Volumes								

**See Page 1 for definition of Minority

Student Population Data: List Current Minority Student Enrollment (F.T.E.) by Race/Ethnicity:

___American Indian ___Black

___Alaskan Native ___Mexican-American

___Puerto Rican ___Other (Specify)

No. of minority students expected to be affected by this project____________.

*To be completed by all applicants, using most current institutional data available.

INSTITUTIONAL BUDGET FOR SCIENCE
[To be completed for each science department involved in proposed project]

(Science Department)

(Name of Institution)

ITEM	19__ - ____	CURRENT ACADEMIC YEAR	19__- ___	PROPOSED PROJECT EXPENDITURES(TOTAL)
1. Personnel Salaries				
2. Curricular Materials				
3. Instructional Equipment				
4. Research Equipment				
5. Other Operating Costs				
6. Total (Add 1-5)				
7. Entire Social and Natural Sciences Budget				/////////////////////// //////////////////////
8. % of Entire Science Budget (6÷7)x100				/////////////////////// ///////////////////////

CHECKLIST FOR INSTITUTIONAL AND COOPERATIVE PROPOSALS

- ____________________Cover Sheet
  - __________Type of Proposal Indicated
  - ___________One copy with original signatures of proposed Project Director and Authorized Official* of Institution
- __________________Completed Forms
  - ___________Budget Sheet
  - ___________Supplementary Budget Pages
  - ___________Project Summary Pages
  - ___________Institutional Data Sheet
  - ___________Institutional Budget Pages
  - ___________Two Postcards
- __________________15 Copies of Proposal
  - ___________Information on Current Proposed Project
  - ___________Summary Information on Previous Science Education Awards (if applicable)
  - ___________Abstract
  - ___________Narrative
  - ___________Curriculum Vitae
  - ___________Local Review Statement**
- _______________3 Copies of catalog

*For cooperative proposals, original signatures of an authorized official and an assisting project director from each participating institution are required.

**For cooperative proposals, a Local Review Statement must be included from each of the cooperating institutions.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
Office of the Director
Washington, D.C. 20550

Notice No. 73 May 8, 1978

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES AND HEADS OF OTHER NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION GRANTEE ORGANIZATIONS

Subject: **Further Simplification of NSF Reporting Requirements and Enforcement of these Requirements**

For some time, the National Science Foundation has required three reports for all completed grants: a Financial Status Report; a Summary of Completed Project; and a Final Technical Report. In 1977, the Foundation announced a proposed simplification of final fiscal reporting through the use of NSF's computerized Federal Cash Transactions Report which is distributed quarterly for completion by grantees. I am pleased to note that the new reporting system received very favorable comments from grantees. It has just been implemented with the FCTR for the period ending March 31, 1978 and individual Financial Status Report forms are no longer required.

A final technical report has been a long-standing requirement for NSF awards. It contains the scientific information needed by NSF program managers to monitor the results of projects within their areas of responsibility. The Summary of Completed Project was introduced in 1976 as a mechanism for informing the Congress and the general public about the results of NSF-funded research. In addition to being supplied to the Congress and the public in response to requests for information, the abstracts are published annually.

Along with our review of fiscal reporting in 1977, we initiated a review of the data elements required by NSF in the Summary of Completed Project and the final technical report with a view to simplifying these requirements as well. The review indicated that some of the information required in the two reports is identical or similar. Accordingly, we have now redesigned the formats of these reports to combine the common elements into a single form. Copies of the new format and the associated instructions are attached for local reproduction and immediate use. Along with a reduction in duplicate reporting elements, the new form recognizes the fact that some information may not be available at the same time the report is due. The form provides blocks for the principal investigator to check to indicate the submission status of these items.

With this change, the Foundation considers it has reduced its reporting requirements to an absolute minimum consistent with adequate accountability for the use of public funds. We have tried to make the reporting as simple and convenient as possible. Principal Investigators and grantee institutions have an obligation to carry out these requirements in a timely and careful manner. Overdue reports not only raise questions about accountability, but divert resources from productive activities to expensive followup activities.

NSF will require compliance with these simplified reporting requirements; final fiscal information through submission of the FCTR; information on project results through submission of the Final Project Report. In addition to telephone calls, reminder correspondence, and visits by NSF staff to review grantee recordkeeping problems, the Division of Grants and Contracts will monitor overdue report submissions to assure that these two requirements have been fulfilled on prior, expired awards before new awards are made.

Some NSF awards contain requirements for unique reports or other end products. Special provisions for such requirements are included in the award instrument. Nothing in this Notice should be construed as waiving such provisions.

Finally, the Foundation appreciates the comments and suggestions for additional paperwork improvements in response to Important Notice No. 65. Some of these suggestions have been adopted and will be reflected in future editions of NSF program brochures and the Grant Policy Manual.

Richard Atkinson

Richard C. Atkinson
Director

Attachments

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
Washington, D.C. 20550

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

NSF FORM 98A

PLEASE READ INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE BEFORE COMPLETING

PART I–PROJECT IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION

1. Institution and Address	**2. NSF Program**	**3. NSF Award Number**
	4. Award Period **From** **To**	**5. Cumulative Award Amount**

6. Project Title

PART II–SUMMARY OF COMPLETED PROJECT *(FOR PUBLIC USE)*

PART III–TECHNICAL INFORMATION *(FOR PROGRAM MANAGEMENT USES)*

1. ITEM *(Check appropriate blocks)*	NONE	ATTACHED	PREVIOUSLY FURNISHED	TO BE FURNISHED SEPARATELY TO PROGRAM	
				Check (√)	Approx. Date
a. Abstracts of Theses					
b. Publication Citations					
c. Data on Scientific Collaborators					
d. Information on Inventions					
e. Technical Description of Project and Results	▨				
f. Other *(specify)*	▨				

2. Principal Investigator/Project Director Name *(Typed)*	3. Principal Investigator/Project Director Signature	4. Date

NSF Form 98A (5-78) Supersedes All Previous Editions

Form Approved OMB No. 99R0013

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FINAL PROJECT REPORT
(NSF FORM 98A)

This report is due within 90 days after the expiration of the award. It should be submitted in two copies to:

National Science Foundation
Division of Grants and Contracts
Post-Award Projects Branch
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20550

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART I

These identifying data items should be the same as on the award documents.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART II

The summary (about 200 words) must be self-contained and intelligible to a scientifically literate reader. Without restating the project title, it should begin with a topic sentence stating the project's major thesis. The summary should include, if pertinent to the project being described, the following items:

- The primary objectives and scope of the project.
- The techniques or approaches used only to the degree necessary for comprehension.
- The findings and implications stated as concisely and informatively as possible.

This summary will be published in an annual NSF report. Authors should also be aware that the summary may be used to answer inquiries by nonscientists as to the nature and significance of the research. Scientific jargon and abbreviations should be avoided.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART III

Items in Part III may, but need not, be submitted with this Final Project Report. Place a check mark in the appropriate block next to each item to indicate the status of your submission.

a. Self-explanatory.
b. For publications (published and planned) include title, journal or other reference, date, and authors. Provide two copies of any reprints as they become available.
c. Scientific Collaborators: provide a list of co-investigators, research assistants and others associated with the project. Include title or status, e.g. associate professor, graduate student, etc.
d. Briefly describe any inventions which resulted from the project and the status of pending patent applications, if any.
e. Provide a technical summary of the activities and results. The information supplied in proposals for further support, updated as necessary, may be used to fulfill this requirement.
f. Include any additional material, either specifically required in the award instrument (e.g. special technical reports or products such as films, books, studies) or which you consider would be useful to the Foundation.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
Office of the Director
Washington, D.C. 20550

Notice No. 68

November 1, 1977

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES AND HEADS OF OTHER NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION GRANTEE ORGANIZATIONS

Subject: **Simplified Procedures for Close-out of NSF Awards**

Historically, the National Science Foundation has required the submission of a final fiscal report within ninety days following the expiration date of each grant. This form contained detailed expenditure information by line items corresponding to those in the budget on which the grant was based. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-110 (which was implemented by NSF in the new Grant Policy Manual effective October 1, 1977) prescribed a new report form, SF 269, Financial Status Report and eliminated the traditional NSF line item fiscal report.

As part of our effort to reduce the administrative burden on our grantees (see Important Notice No. 65 dated July 29, 1977) we have reviewed the information items to be supplied by grantees in the new Financial Status Report. Based on this study, we have concluded that the expenditure information needed by NSF to close out completed awards is also provided by grantees in the new quarterly Federal Cash Transaction Report, SF 272, also prescribed by OMB Circular A-110 (which replaced the Foundation's Quarterly Expenditure Report). The Foundation's version of SF 272 is a computerized report sent to grantees in the month following every calendar quarter.

The Foundation has decided that the benefits gained by NSF from the receipt of a separate Financial Status Report for each grant do not outweigh the additional workload and expense on the part of grantees. Accordingly, we are prepared to adjust our internal administrative procedures to extract the expenditure data supplied by grantees on SF 272 for purposes of final grant accountability and eliminate the requirement for submission of an SF 269 for each grant. This change will eliminate the preparation and mailing by grantees of about 10,000 individual report forms each year.

We plan to introduce this simplification in January of 1978. Before doing so, however, we want to provide grantees the opportunity to review the implementation procedures to assure that they are realistic and do not create unforeseen difficulties.

The proposed procedures for the use of the Federal Cash Transactions Report for purposes of grant close-out are attached. We welcome any comments or suggestions you may have concerning the above. Please address them to Mr. Robert A. Michelitch, Division of Grants and Contracts, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550.

Richard C. Atkinson

Richard C. Atkinson
Director

Attachment

IMPLEMENTING PROCEDURES - IMPORTANT NOTICE NO. 68

Effective January 1, 1978, grantees will not be required to submit a separate Financial Status Report for each completed grant. The Foundation will use the expenditure data reported in the quarterly Federal Cash Transactions Report (FCTR) for purposes of grant closeout.

The Foundation's computerized version of the Federal Cash Transactions Report (formerly known as the Quarterly Expenditure Report) is forwarded to each grantee institution in the month following the close of each calendar quarter. No changes are contemplated to the usual procedures for the completion and return of this report by grantees. (Instructions are provided with the reports).

The total disbursement reported for an award that expired prior to the beginning of the quarter covered by the FCTR will be considered the final fiscal accounting for that award. The difference, if any, between the total award amounts and the "final" disbursements will be deobligated by the Foundation for use in funding other worthwhile projects.

In cases where a valid unpaid obligation exists under a particular award, an estimate to cover the obligation should be charged against the NSF cash advanced and reported in the FCTR as disbursed. If upon liquidation of the obligation, the actual disbursement varies from the estimate by $300 or more, the Post Award Projects Branch of the Division of Grants and Contracts should be notified of the circumstances by letter and an appropriate adjustment will be made in the previously reported disbursement. Adjustments will not be made when the difference between the estimate and actual disbursement is less than $300. Estimated costs of publication of project results should be treated as valid unpaid obligations and charged against the NSF Cash advances and reported in the FCTR as disbursed in the same manner as other obligations.

The requirement for submission of a Summary of Completed Project and a final technical report for each grant within ninety days following the expiration date of a grant continues in effect. They should be forwarded to the Division of Grants and Contracts, Post Award Projects Branch as soon after the expiration date as is practicable.

90%